



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,876	11/18/2003	Hideto Matsumoto	116531	3120
25944 7590 04/15/2008 OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850				
EXAMINER				
DINH, KHANH Q				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
2151				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
04/15/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

### Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/714,876

**Applicant(s)**

MATSUMOTO, HIDETO

**Examiner**

Khanh Dinh

**Art Unit**

2151

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 26 December 2007.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1,2 and 4-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-8508)
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_
- Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This is in response to the Amendment and Remarks filed on 12/26/2007. Claims 1-28 are presented for examination.

#### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8-19, 21-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono et al., US pat. No.6,996,535 in view of Lazaridis et al., US pat. no.6,219,694.

As to claims 1, 21, 22, 23, 27 and 28, Ono discloses that in a communication system having a mail server and a plurality of electronic devices which are connected with a network, a predetermined e-mail address being assigned to said plurality of electronic devices, each of said plurality of electronic devices comprising:

a first determination system (210 fig.4) that determines whether an e-mail address of an e-mail message transmitted to said mail server coincides with the predetermined e-mail address (checking for coincidence between the received status of trading information including email with previously stored in the storage device, see abstract, figs.3, 4, col.5 lines 9-63 and col.7 lines 9-36; a second determination system that determines whether

the e-mail message addressed to the predetermined e-mail address is directed to the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs in accordance with contents of the e-mail message addressed to the predetermined e-mail address (selecting and transmitting orders, see col.6 lines 2-42); and a processing system that executes a procedure corresponding to the e-mail message when said second determination system determines that the e-mail message is directed to the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs (see col. 6 line 43 to col.7 line 60).

Ono does not specifically disclose using a predetermined common e-mail address being commonly assigned to and shared by the plurality of electronic devices. However, Lazaridis discloses using a predetermined common e-mail address being commonly assigned to and shared by the plurality of electronic devices (the mobile device and the host system share a common electronic address so that messages generated at either the host system or the mobile data communication device are configured using the common electronic address, see abstract, fig.1 and col.7 line 31 to col.8 line 55). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Lazaridis's teachings into the computer system of Ono for sharing information between network devices because it would have enabled users to continuously redirect certain data items from a network device to other network devices in a communication network.

As to claim 2, Ono discloses a destination device information obtaining system that obtains information of a destination device of the e-mail message in accordance with

Art Unit: 2151

the contents of the e-mail message, said second determination system determining whether the e-mail message is directed to the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs in accordance with whether the information of the destination device designates the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs (see fig.4, col. 5 line 54 to col.6 line 58 and col.7 line 9-60).

As to claim 4, Ono discloses that the e-mail message includes a first character string having a predetermined character string followed by a second character string having information designating the destination device (see col.7 lines 23-60 and col.11 lines 16-51).

As to claim 5, Ono discloses that the e-mail message has attached data to be processed, wherein each of said plurality of electronic device has data type obtaining system that obtains a data type of the attached data from the contents of the e-mail message, and wherein said second determination system determines whether the e-mail message is directed to the electronic device to which said second determination system belongs based on whether the attached data can be processed by said electronic device (see col.9 line 19 to col.10 line 57 and col.11 lines 17-52).

As to claim 6, Ono discloses that processing of the attached data including printing of the attached data (see col.11 line 25 to col.12 line 57).

Art Unit: 2151

As to claim 8, Ono discloses an e-mail deleting system that deletes the e-mail message corresponding to the procedure executed by the processing system from the mail server (see col.11 line 25 to col.12 line 57).

As to claim 9, Ono discloses an e-mail deleting system that deletes the e-mail message corresponding to the procedure executed by the processing system from the mail server predetermine period after the procedure has been executed (see col.9 line 19 to col.10 line 57 and col.11 lines 17-52).

As to claim 10, Ono discloses that the procedure executed by said processing system includes creation and transmission of a replying e-mail message replying to the e-mail message (see col.9 line 19 to col.10 line 57 and col.11 lines 17-52).

As to claim 11, Ono discloses that the e-mail message contains a request for a status of the electronic device, and wherein the replying e-mail message contains a status of the electronic device to which the processing system belongs (see col.9 line 19 to col.10 line 57 and col.11 lines 17-52).

As to claim 12, Ono discloses that the e-mail message has attached data to be processed, and wherein processing of the attached data including printing of the attached data (see col.11 line 25 to col.12 line 57).

Art Unit: 2151

Claims 13-19 are rejected for the same reasons set forth in claims 1, 2, 8, 9-12 respectively.

As to claim 24, Ono discloses that the communication system is configured such that, when the mail server receives the e-mail message including the information indicative of the designating at least one of the plurality of electronic devices and information indicative of the designated information, a replying e-mail message containing a status in terms of the designated information of the designated at least one of the plurality of electronic devices being transmitted to said computer (see col.9 line 19 to col.10 line 57 and col.11 lines 17-52).

As to claim 25, Ono discloses a display, a visual interface being provided so as to display a window on said display, the window allowing the operator to select at least one of the plurality of electronic devices sharing the common e-mail address, the visual interface inserting information indicative of the selected at least one of the plurality of electronic devices in the e-mail message (see col.9 line 19 to col.10 line 57 and col.11 lines 17-52).

As to claim 26, Ono discloses that the window displayed on said display allows the operator to select one or more pieces of information to be obtained from the designated one of the plurality of electronic devices, the visual interface inserting information indicative of the one or more pieces of information to be obtained from the designated at

least one of the plurality of electronic devices in the e-mail message (see col.11 line 25 to col.12 line 57).

4. Claims 7 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Ono and Lazaridis and further in view of Taniguchi et al., US pat. No.6,801,962. Ono and Lazaridis's teachings still applied as in item 3 above. Ono does not specifically disclose the status includes at least one of a remaining amount of toner and a remaining amount of sheet and the attached data is TIFF format data. However, Taniguchi discloses the status includes at least one of a remaining amount of toner and a remaining amount of sheet and the attached data is TIFF format data (see col.15 line 25 to col.16 line 37). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to implement Taniguchi's teachings into the computer system of Ono to process printing data information because it would have enabled users to check the appropriate printing displays and therefore prevented unnecessary outputs in a communication network.

***Allowable Subject Matter***

5. Claim 3 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.



***Response to Arguments***

6. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-28 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

7. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the date of this final action.

Art Unit: 2151

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Khanh Dinh whose telephone number is (571) 272-3936. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:00 A.m. to 5:00 P.m.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zami Maung, can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for this group is (571) 273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

**Any response to this action should be mailed to:**

Commissioner for patents  
P O Box 1450  
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450

/Khanh Dinh/

Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2151